

Application No.: 10/804,913  
Amendment dated: December 27, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 26, 2005  
Attorney Docket No.: 22176.26 (ITW-14186)

b.) Remarks

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16, 22, 26, 28, 29, 31 and 33 have been amended to explicitly indicate that the claims are directed to a method.

Claims 3 and 25 have been amended to address language inconsistencies.

Claims 8, 23, 24, 27, 30, 32, 34 and 36 have been amended to indicate on which claim they depend.

Support for the claim amendments is found throughout the specification and in the originally filed claims. No new matter is being introduced.

In the Election/Restrictions mailed from the United States Patent and Trademark Office on September 26, 2005, the claims have been grouped in two groups, as process and apparatus for its practice. It is respectfully noted that Claim 6 includes the word "method" and thus belongs in Group II.

In response to the Restriction Requirement, Applicants select the claims of Group II. However, all the claims are directed to a method and Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16, 22, 26, 28, 29, 31 and 33 have been amended to include the word "method".


Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement are respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/804,913  
Amendment dated: December 27, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of September 26, 2005  
Attorney Docket No.: 22176.26 (ITW-14186)

Applicants believe that the present application is ready for examination on the merits. Should any questions arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Houston Eliseeva LLP

By 

Maria Eliseeva  
Registration No.: 43,328  
Tel.: 781 863 9991  
Fax: 781 863 9931

4 Militia Dr., Suite 4  
Lexington, Massachusetts 02421  
Date: December 27, 2005